

## REMARKS

Claims 32-54 remain in this application. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection - Richardson in view of Mital**

The Examiner has rejected previous claims 1-5, 8-15 and 18-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,028,764 issued to Richardson et al. ("Richardson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,878,282 issued to Mital ("Mital").

These claims have been cancelled, therefore the rejection is believed to be moot. Without admitting the appropriateness of Richardson and Mital, Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are allowable any combination of Richardson and Mital.

**Claim 32** recites a computer comprising at least "a computing display subsystem" that includes at least "a processor" and "a display controller". Any combination of Richardson and Mital does not teach or suggest such a computer.

In particular, the Examiner has previously argued on page 3 of the Office Action mailed 11/03/2003 (Paper No. 6), in essence, that the display controller is equivalent to the claimed processor. However, Applicants have amended claim 32 to recite both a display controller and a processor, as shown and supported in Applicants Figure 7. Reciting both the processor and the display controller in the same claim clarifies that the processor is different than a display controller. In any event, any combination of Richardson and Mital does not teach or suggest both a processor and a display controller in a computing display subsystem.

Accordingly, **claim 32** and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable. Independent **claims 39 and 43**, and their respective dependent claims, are believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

**Claim 50** recites “a computing display subsystem comprising” at least “a processor” and “wherein the processor is operable to operate at a higher frequency power mode when the computing display subsystem is connected to the base station, and at a lower frequency power mode when the computing display subsystem is detached from the base station”.

Applicants submit that these limitations are not taught or suggested in any combination of Richardson and Mital. Accordingly, **claim 50** and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

### **Request For Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request For An Extension Of Time**

The Applicants respectfully petition for a two-month extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). A check in amount of \$450.00 is included for this fee.

### **Charge Our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 6/24/05

Brent E. Vecchia

Brent E. Vecchia  
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980